CONNECTICUT
STATE LIBRARY
HARTFORD

HEADQUARTERS NEWS LETTER

NATIONAL·AMERICAN·WOMAN·SUFFRAGE·ASSOCIATION
171 · MADISON · AVE. NEW · YORK · CITY

VOLUME II NUMBER XI

NOVEMBER - 25 - 1916

"The Lady From Montana"

JAN 30 1917

HEADQUARTERS NEWS LETTER

A printed attempt to maintain intimate contact between the National American Woman Suffrage Association and its thousands of members throughout the country.

Published once a month by the National American Woman Suffrage Association, at 171 Madison Ave., New York, N. Y. Subscription price per year, 25c.

Entered as second class matter, Oct. 6, 1915, at Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

—o—

National American Woman Suffrage Association

Honorary President
DR. ANNA HOWARD SHAW

President
MRS. CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT

1st Vice-President
MRS. WALTER MCNAB MILLER

2nd Vice-President
MRS. STANLEY MCCORMICK

3rd Vice-President
MISS ESTHER G. OGDEN

Recording Secretary
MRS. THOMAS JEFFERSON SMITH

Corresponding Secretary
MRS. FRANK J. SHULER

Treasurer
MRS. HENRY WADE ROGERS

1st Auditor
MISS HELOISE MEYER

2nd Auditor
MRS. PATTIE RUFFNER JACOBS

Congressional Committee

Headquarters:
Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

THE LADY FROM MONTANA

Miss Jeannette Rankin, of Missoula, Montana, has been elected to the House of Representatives of the United States, the first woman to sit in this assembly, one of the most important congresses in the world. Running on the Republican ticket, she was elected in a state that otherwise went Democratic. With a Prohibition plank in her platform, she won a large plurality in a state that was waging a bitter wet-and-dry fight. The personal triumph that the first "Congresswoman" has achieved is most brilliant.

But the election of Miss Jeannette Rankin is just as emphatic a victory for the women of Montana and the women of the United States as it is for Miss Rankin herself. They now have a personal emissary in the legislative body of the United States who is sure to exert her greatest influence toward the passing of the Federal Suffrage Amendment. Miss Rankin is heart and soul a suffragist and embodied national woman suffrage in her political platform. She has worked for suffrage in the past in state campaigns and she will work for suffrage in the future with the same earnestness and zeal that brought success in Montana when the first suffrage referendum was put to the people of that state.

Miss Rankin's history is one of active service for reform measures. A wholesome, generous nature, she has always been on the side of the "under dog," and ever since her college days—not so very long ago—she has been hard at work, the interests of women and children being her pet hobbies.

"The Lady from Montana" is a graduate of the University of Montana and the New York School of Philanthropy. She worked for suffrage as Field Secretary for the National American Woman Suffrage Association, as organizer and speaker in many states, and as lobbyist in Washington and at the state legislatures of New York, New Hampshire, Delaware, Florida, North Dakota and Montana. As a result of her practical study of social conditions, economics and politics, Congressman Rankin will be very much at home when she takes her seat in the House of Representatives in 1917.

* * *

WHAT THE WOMEN HAVE PROVED— AND WHAT THEY HAVE LEARNED

The elections over, it is well to take cognizance of the results as they affect our cause. Certainly the suffragists brought out of the election everything they had when they went into it. They lost nothing. That they gained a great deal no careful analyst will deny.

As a matter of fact the election proved that women do vote; that they vote independently; that they know what they want; that they vote effectively, since the press of the country very generally announce that the woman vote was the balance of power which elected Mr. Wilson; that the woman's vote of the big West is a power too important to go unconsidered; that women know how to organize and to campaign; that the women divide into parties as men do; that they cannot be driven or coaxed to vote against a party because its eastern attitude on suffrage is antiquated. All these things suffragists knew long ago, but they have been borne in upon the understanding of millions who never knew them before.

Just at present there is evidence of irritability on the part of some Republicans toward woman suffrage because the women of the West seem to have voted so largely for Mr. Wilson. A letter from Indiana states that the Republicans in that state, quite forgetting Oregon and Illinois, say they can do nothing to help the women there to get the vote because so many women voted Democratic. A letter from Missouri says the Democrats there have become suddenly much more favorable. Thus the gains and losses offset each other.

One distressed gentleman is so disturbed by the woman's vote that he thinks the whole election can be thrown out by the Supreme Court on the ground that no state has the right to extend the vote for the president to women! We may hope he will bring his case. It would add to the gaiety of the suffrage campaign.

The Republican Party is apparently studying the faults and weaknesses of its own campaign to learn wherein it failed. The Republicans are doing that most human of all things, trying to find someone to blame.

It may have listened hopefully to the claim of certain suffragists that four million of women's votes were going against Mr. Wilson anyway. It may be

that when it sent the "Hughes Special" it thought to make that prediction more certain. But the Republican Party made a fatal mistake if it wished to gain the women's votes.

At its Chicago convention it listened to the protests of Eastern reactionaries and put a states rights rider on the plank in its platform. That rider took all the appeal to women voters out of the plank.

More, the Republicans in Iowa in June "double crossed" the amendment in the referendum and were responsible for its defeat. Positive orders were given by Republicans in South Dakota and in West Virginia to turn down the suffrage amendment there in November. No party can be guilty of duplicity and perfidy in one part of the country and expect that the facts will not be perfectly well known in another.

No one will claim that the defeat of the Republicans was due to woman suffrage alone; but it was a factor. Even Mr. Hughes' endorsement of the Federal Amendment could not antidote the action of Iowa Republicans which told all too plainly that the "machine" did not propose to honor the plank.

* * *

The Democrats are as guilty of orders to bury the amendments in the three referenda of this year; but most of the States of the far West have been Democratic for some years and the women who wanted to serve woman suffrage evidently followed the known reasoning of some of their leaders, who said: "We shall stick by the men who have stood by us in our suffrage struggle at home, for we can trust them to stand by the women of the nation."

* * *

The Democrats are a bit surprised at their good fortune for threats had been plentiful of opposite results. They should be grateful to the women who supported them, and some are. It is not strange that Northern papers should call upon Democrats to show their appreciation by action in Congress, but it is gratifying and notable that several Southern papers have made the same call in no uncertain tone. The *Nashville Tennessean* declares that Congress should at its short session submit the amendment and supports its declaration with an earnest plea. The Houston (Texas) *Chronicle* says even more significantly: "Previous to the election it was conceded that a national amendment granting women the franchise could not be adopted because the fifteen Southern states would oppose it. The South finds itself in a position where it can no longer take such a stand without exhibiting gross ingratitude. Thus by their support of President Wilson the women have removed by far the greatest obstacle to the passage of the Susan B. Anthony Amendment."

* * *

The *New Republic* in an editorial on suffrage says that it is now time for the National Woman Suffrage Association to revise its non-partisan tactics, although it fails to make clear whether it arrived at this conclusion because a group of suffragists setting out to defeat a candidate failed to do so! In another editorial on prohibition it reminds its readers that a "Federal Amendment requires the support not of *one* but of *both* parties." Why this difference. Somebody's brain skids.

The time may come when partisanship will be necessary, but it is quite safe to say that the majority of suffragists will stick to the "safe and sane" middle of the road non-partisanship until a dominant party comes forward which is honestly for suffrage in all parts of the country at once, East and West, North and South. If there is such a party now it is successfully hiding its identity.

* * *

Whether Iowa, West Virginia and South Dakota would have been won for suffrage had there been an honest election and no anti orders from political machines, no one can tell. The startling fact is that there were fraud and irregularities in all three. Shortly before the election Judge Wood of Berkeley County, W. Va., in a charge to a Grand Jury about investigating the sale of votes said:

"The will of the people is no longer represented in the elections of Berkeley County. It has degenerated into an auction where the man giving the highest price gets the office."

The story of all three will prove when finished a terrible indictment of American politics. That story should convince every fair minded Congressman that "Chivalry" can be no more practically applied than by submitting to the legislatures of the States, the Federal Suffrage Amendment.

* * *

CONGREGATIONALISTS ENDORSE SUFFRAGE

The Autumnal Conference of the Congregational Church of Rhode Island held recently at Howard, R. I., adopted the following resolution favoring full suffrage for women:

> "*Whereas*, 4,000,000 women in one-fourth of the states of the Union are now entitled to vote, and whereas, the women of Australia, New Zealand, a large part of Canada and several important European countries now vote upon equal terms with men, and
>
> "*Whereas*, such important Protestant denominations as the Unitarian, the Presbyterian and the Methodist have endorsed the justice and righteousness of granting to women the political franchise, and
>
> "*Whereas*, the women of the Congregational Church are as loyal, devoted and responsive to the calls of Christian service as any body of women in the world, be it
>
> "*Resolved*, that this Autumnal Conference of Rhode Island Congregational Churches, assembled on the ninth day of November, 1916, in the Franklin Church of Howard, does hereby endorse, giving the franchise to women on the same terms as men and advocates securing the same either by State or Federal action."

* * *

The NEWS LETTER calls attention to an error in the 1916 Handbook of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, which listed the "Nevada Voters Club, Inc.," incorrectly as the "Women's Citizen Club."

STUNTS THAT ARE VOTE-WINNERS

That suffragists are learning to plan stunts that will not only assure publicity but that will gain votes as well is evinced by the activities of our women during the past month in all parts of the country.

In Pennsylvania the suffragists seized the opportunity afforded by the Pittsburgh centennial celebration and launched a suffrage float in the centennial parade. Forty-eight of Pittsburgh's fairest daughters adorned this float, which was conceded by those who thronged the line of march to be the most beautiful float in the parade.

Pittsburgh suffragists have always taken an interest in civic affairs and their action in helping to make the centennial parade a success is merely an additional instance of the way they keep visualizing the cause to the voters of Allegheny County.

In Wisconsin the suffragists lined up Congressman John M. Nelson on the second Federal Amendment Day and made him the headliner at their celebration program on the steps of the State Capitol at Madison. Congressman Nelson caught the true spirit of the occasion and not only pledged his support to the Federal Amendment, but consented to pose for a photograph with the Wisconsin suffrage delegation.

SOME OF THE PITTSBURGH BELLES WHO HELPED TO WIN THE VERDICT OF "THE MOST BEAUTIFUL FLOAT IN THE PARADE" FOR THE PENNSYLVANIA SUFFRAGISTS DURING THE RECENT PITTSBURGH CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION.

In Minneapolis, the suffragists staged a "White Elephant Sale," November 1st to 4th, inclusive. This sale was both picturesque and profitable. As may be guessed, the contributions to the sale were most interesting and the number of articles sold proved conclusively that what might be considered a "White Elephant" by one person is frequently a most desirable possession for another. At any rate the Minneapolis stunt was a huge success. Two thousand seven hundred dollars was taken in and as the expenses of the sale amounted to only three hundred dollars, the net profits were two thousand four hundred dollars.

The Minneapolis suffragists made effective use of the "White Elephant" idea in their advertising for the sale, using both "White Elephant" postal cards and posters in their advance

CONGRESSMAN JOHN M. NELSON OF WISCONSIN, AND A SQUAD OF THE WISCONSIN SUFFRAGISTS WHO CELEBRATED FEDERAL AMENDMENT DAY ON THE STEPS OF THE STATE CAPITOL AT MADISON, OCTOBER 21ST.

campaign. All of this attracted most valuable attention to the cause, especially as some of the most prominent and representative women of the city were interested in the sale.

In New York City and in Cleveland on Election Night, suffrage balls were staged, at which the music of the fox trot was frequently interrupted by the megaphone of the announcer, who was transmitting the returns to the anxious prospective voters. Both these balls attracted favorable attention from the newspapers.

Suffrage cabarets have also become quite popular recently and have been successfully staged in a dozen cities in Massachusetts.

In planning future suffrage stunts, one fact which the women should keep before them is that woman suffrage has become one of the big political issues of the day. Consequently the stunts that will afford the most valuable publicity in the next few months are those which will possess a political flavor and will tend to attract the attention of the man reader, who, on the average, is more interested in politics than pink teas.

One effective way to reach him in your community might be to get up a symposium of views from a dozen or more of the local politicians setting forth briefly their ideas as to when the Federal Amendment will be passed. Most local newspapers would be glad to publish such a symposium.

THREE OF THE WOMEN WHO CAPITALIZED "WHITE ELEPHANTS" FOR SUFFRAGE AT THE MINNEAPOLIS "WHITE ELEPHANT" SALE.

NATIONAL SUFFRAGE SCHOOLS

One of the most successful undertakings ever launched by the National American Woman Suffrage Association was the opening of the first of a series of suffrage schools in Baltimore, Md., during the week of November 13th. A large attendance, enthusiastic meetings, and widespread and favorable publicity took the new project out of the experiment class and set a high standard for the other national suffrage schools which are to open in January in non-suffrage states.

The school consisted of six days of intensive training in campaign methods and means, including lectures in organization, federal and legislative work, suffrage history and argument, press and publicity, public speaking, and even the gentle art of money raising. Classes were open from 9:30 to 5, and during two evening sessions there was a model open air meeting and a large public mass meeting. The open air gathering was staged on a public corner, the object being to show the suffrage students just how such meetings should be conducted, even to the handling of difficult hecklers.

The faculty of the Baltimore school was made up of experts in the various phases of suffrage activity. Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, President of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, headed the list of instructors and brought the school to a rousing finish at the end of the week with her lectures on political organization, federal and legislative work. Mrs. Halsey W. Wilson handled the classes in suffrage history and argument giving the embryo campaigners specific pointers on the background and philosophy of the woman suffrage movement. Mrs. Arthur Livermore, of New York, conducted the courses in public speaking, and Mrs. Rose Geyer, of Iowa, imparted the lessons of press and publicity work as gleaned by her during the recent suffrage campaigns in Iowa and West Virginia.

Mrs. Charles E. Ellicott, President of the Equal Suffrage League of Baltimore and "Manager" of the school, wrote to the National Association that the school had left a splendid impression in Baltimore and that the suffrage cause there will have a new impetus as a result of the training that the women have had in this short course.

The *Baltimore American* wrote of the school as follows:

"Baltimore has been first in many things and now it seems that it will be first in possession of a school for the training of women in the principles of the suffrage propaganda and program. The plan is a most excellent one and no city could be selected with better propriety than the one in which centers so many forms of educational enterprise and where suffrage for the female sex has advocates as intelligent, progressive and enterprising as here."

PROGRESS OF THE SUSAN B. ANTHONY AMENDMENT

KNOWN IN THE

64TH CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES AS

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 1.

Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States Conferring upon Women the Right of Suffrage.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article be proposed to the legislatures of the several states as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by three-fourths of the said legislatures, shall be valid as part of said Constitution, namely:

"ARTICLE

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power, by appropriate legislation, to enforce the provisions of this article."

History of Amendment.

First introduced in the Senate, January 10, 1878, by Senator A. A. Sargent, of California.

REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE:

In the Senate:

1878, Adverse majority.
1882, Favorable majority, adverse minority.
1884, Favorable majority, adverse minority.
1886, Favorable majority, adverse minority.
1889, Favorable majority, adverse minority.
1890, Without recommendation.
1893, Favorable majority, adverse minority.
1896, Without recommendation.
1913, Favorable majority.
1914, Favorable majority.
1916, Favorable majority.

VOTED UPON IN THE SENATE:

January 25, 1887, yeas 16, nays 34.
March 19, 1914, yeas 35, nays 34.

IN THE HOUSE REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE:

1883, Favorable majority.
1884, Adverse majority, favorable minority.
1886, Adverse majority, favorable minority.
1890, Favorable majority.
1894, Adverse majority.
1914, Without recommendation.

VOTED UPON IN THE HOUSE:

January 12, 1915; yeas 174, nays 204.

Introduced in the 64th Congress

IN THE SENATE:

December 7, 1915, by Senator Sutherland, of Utah, Senator Thomas, of Colorado, and Senator Thompson, of Kansas.
Referred in the Senate to Committee on Woman Suffrage.
Reported in the Senate on January 8, with a favorable recommendation.

IN THE HOUSE:

December 6, 1915. by Representatives Raker, Mondell, Keating Taylor and Hayden.
Referred in the House to the Judiciary Committee, and by it to its sub-committee No. 1.
Reported to the Judiciary Committee by the sub-committee on February 15, 1916, with recommendation that the Judiciary Committee report it to the House without recommendation. By a vote of 9 to 7, on February 15, the Judiciary Committee returned the amendment to sub-committee No. 1 with instructions to hold until December 14. On March 14, the Judiciary Committee by unanimous consent agreed to take final Committee action on the amendment on March 28. On March 28, the Judiciary Committee by a vote of 10 to 9 postponed indefinitely all Constitutional amendments.

Status:

IN THE SENATE:

On the calendar awaiting action.

IN THE HOUSE:

In the Judiciary Committtee.

CONGRESSIONAL REPORT

The work of the National Congressional Committee during the past month has been chiefly in connection with congressional candidates.

Of the men who replied to our questionnaire sent out in August, 244 secured the nomination. This is a little over one-fourth of the entire number of congressional nominees, and when we consider that with few exceptions we did not send letters to candidates in the states where women vote for members of Congress, this seems to us an exceedingly good proportion.

The replies to the three questions were divided as follows: On the question of the Federal Amendment 161 answered yes, 38 answered no, and 45 were non-committal. To the question as to whether they believe in the principle of suffrage 196 replied yes, 22 replied no, and 26 were non-committal. One hundred and fifty-eight expressed their willingness to work in committee for the Federal Amendment; 29 were unwilling to do so, and 57 were non-committal. Our replies were fairly evenly divided between the two dominant parties, 102 Democrats responding to our questionnaire and 134 Republicans. Of the 8 others 5 were Progressives and 3 Socialists.

Of the 244 nominees who replied, 99 are present members of congress who are standing for re-election. A comparison of their replies with the reports of our lobbyists shows that a number of these have adopted a more favorable attitude toward the Federal Amendment since they were interviewed in Washington during the past session of Congress. Many who were strongly opposed have softened their replies to a non-committal or evasive answer, showing that the strong suffrage sentiment in the atmosphere this fall has not been without its effect on them.

In reports sent us from the states have been two bits of news which are especially encouraging to us. Mr. Mann, Republican leader in the House, who has heretofore been very lukewarm in his support of the Federal Amendment, is reported by the Chicago women to have spoken very decisively in its favor at a luncheon on Federal Amendment Day, given for the Chicago candidates. Mrs. Morrisson writes that Mr. Mann put himself on record in one of the strongest suffrage speeches she ever heard, saying that he had only voted for the amendment in the past but that he expected to work and vote for it in the future. This is most encouraging news, as there is probably no member of the House whose support would mean more to us. Mr. Dyer, of St. Louis, whose vote prevented our measure from being reported out of the Judiciary Committee during the past session, also attended a Federal Amendment Day luncheon given in honor of candidates. He likewise reassured the suffrage women of his friendly attitude toward our measure.

The fact that so large a proportion of nominees replied favorably to our questions, and the indication which incomplete returns give that a very large number of these were elected, are encouraging signs of an increase of suffrage sentiment in the Sixty-fifth Congress.

AS THE NEWSPAPERS SEE IT

HOW THE WOMEN VOTED

The election returns show the futility of any proposal for a women's party. It is to the credit of the women that they did not vote as a sex, but as intelligent human beings. They did not vote solidly for Hughes because he had promised national suffrage, nor did they vote solidly for Wilson because he kept us out of war. They viewed all the issues of the campaign as the male voters viewed them.

Republican leaders who made a special effort to capture the woman vote must realize now that there is no special argument that can be depended upon to win that sex.

Illinois, where the women voted for President for the first time, is a normal Republican State and went into the Republican column. Ohio, which for 50 years has voted the Republican ticket, swung into the Democratic column, and there were no women's votes there.

Montana, which went for Roosevelt in 1904, for Taft in 1908 and Wilson in 1912, continued in the Democratic column, as did Nevada.

Against the action of Illinois, where the women's vote did not impair the Republican victory, several Republican States with woman suffrage unexpectedly went into the Democratic column.

The electoral votes of the suffrage States number 91. President Wilson has received 57 of these votes, while Mr. Hughes received 34. Mr. Hughes made the strongest special plea to the women by announcing that he would support a constitutional amendment to give them suffrage nationally. Yet Mr. Wilson seems to have had the best of it in the suffrage States. It is possible, if the votes could be analyzed, Mr. Hughes may have received most of the women's votes, but even this is doubtful.—*Washington (D. C.) Post*, 11, 11, 16.

* * *

THE SUFFRAGE GAINS IN TUESDAY'S ELECTION

Tuesday's election, though it brought the defeat of the Presidential candidate who stood for nation-wide woman suffrage, was encouraging to suffragists. It gave them no new States, but it demonstrated their power and capacity for using it in the States in which they have already secured the vote. They have, according to report, three women electors on the successful electoral ticket in California, and if Miss Rankin's election in Montana is not changed by late returns from a few remote districts yet unheard from, the women will have gained a Representative in Congress. This is a high water mark in the suffragist movement, which knows no ebb and, in spite of blocks and delays, is bound to continue to advance until nation-wide equal suffrage is an accomplished fact.—*Philadelphia Press*, 11, 12, 16.

THE LADY FROM MONTANA

From her own statement to the *Public Ledger* it is evident that Miss Jeannette Rankin of Montana, the first woman to be elected to Congress, does not require any solemn injunction as to the serious nature of her task. Cranks with an ax to grind, a row to hoe, will rise up in all parts of the land to give her superfluous, if not selfish, counsel; her successes will be belittled and her failures magnified by her opponents. She speaks not merely for the eternal feminine in Montana, but for all women, and all women are not of the same mind. She will need to be saved from the zeal of her friends as from the adversary's animus. Of this she may be sure: Her work will be plentiful, her program crowded, her activity upon the floor of the House under a surveillance which might disturb the equipoise of a nature less evenly controlled. But Miss Rankin, it may be assumed from her career thus far, is in the limelight not to glorify herself nor merely to proclaim a triumph for the cause of woman suffrage. She stands in her place to give battle for ameliorative measures that are higher than political interest. Any woman of specialized training and unselfish motivation must be saddened by the sordid dickering that often obtains in the business of legislation under the name of statesmanship. That is a kind of bargaining that moves her to disgust. The country's womanhood is fortunate in finding at Washington a voice that will not cry in a wilderness, for it must win deference at once as the expression of what women with minds of their own and votes of their own are thinking on many questions that ask new light and leading from their point of view.—*Philadelphia Public Ledger*, 11, 12, 16.

* * *

SUFFRAGE ADVANCES SURELY

The part played by the women voters in Tuesday's election shows that they are not only able but willing to take their place at the polls with the men. Entirely aside from the merits of equal suffrage as an academic question, the fact remains that in about half the territory of the country women are voters to-day, and it is a certainty that this right will never be taken away from them. Thus women in the non-suffrage states are discriminated against, not only in lacking the vote which husband or brother has, but in comparison with their sisters fortunate enough to live in more progressive commonwealths. The discrimination should be removed as speedily as possible, so that each community may avail itself of the distinct service which the feminine half of humanity can give to the public in exercising the rights and filling the duties of citizenship.—*New York Tribune*, 11, 9, 16.

WOMEN AND THE BALLOT

The presence of the women yesterday was a decided improvement at the polls. Almost every precinct was conspicuous because of the women voters. The women were not the last to vote, either. They were ready to mark their ballots shortly after the polls were opened. The presence of women voters at Kansas booths is not new, but it is a condition which makes one feel that elections are improving.

The time is not far off when every state will have women at the polls on election day. The women have as much right there as men. Entrance of women into the political life of this nation has not upset anything. The United States will be better for the womens' vote if she votes wisely and not according to the dictates of her husband.

The vote of the women in yesterday's election was far-reaching. It silenced that old political prophet of a few years ago who said "Oh, pshaw, the women don't want to vote. They don't know anything about politics and besides it isn't their sphere." If he had visited the Salina Republican Women's club he might have learned a few things. It is evident that the women of the nation voted with the same seriousness that marks their efforts in every act of importance.—*Salina (Kan.) Journal*, 11, 8, 16.

* * *

WOMEN'S BALLOTS NOT REVOLUTIONARY

Illinois, like all other states that have given either full or partial suffrage to women, has demonstrated that the state's normal political leanings are not seriously upset by doing so. . . .

Partial suffrage for women, as exercised in Illinois last Tuesday, was felt chiefly in an increased registration list, and not conspicuously in favor of individual candidates or individual issues. The same story will be told of full suffrage when the women get it, which is certain.

The experience of other progressive states, in advance of Illinois, has shown that women's ballots are not revolutionary on the greater political issues of the day, national or state. It is doubtless well for the republic's welfare that this is so, and that women voters are proving themselves capable of intelligent use of the ballot on all issues, great or small.

On purely local issues, such as educational or municipal, or on questions of public policy that directly affect public morals, the ballots of women will work more revolutions than on the larger national economic issues. Women are natural reformers when real reforms are needed.

When it comes to choosing a President, women's ballots are likely to represent as many different schools of political thought as those of male voters.—*Chicago Examiner*, 11, 11, 16.

* * *

WOMEN IN ILLINOIS

Whether or not the experience of 1916 vindicates the suffrage amendment depends largely upon the politics of the observer.

The New York Times, for example, a Wilson supporter, can see no good in it because Illinois, with the addition of 75,000 women voters, still gave Hughes a big majority.

The *Times* claims that family influence and environment simply increased the normal vote—the circumstance had the effect of increasing the number of votes without measurably affecting the result of the voting.

The staid, sedate old *Times* will invite a chuckle if it persists in being so facetious.

We can imagine the sage of the *Times* saying something like this if the 75,000 women had voted for Wilson: "The result in Illinois establishes the value of women to government. They completely disregarded the honest convictions of their husbands and brothers and voted for Mr. Wilson."

No, the *Times* must bring some evidence other than that the women voted for Hughes if it would prove their incompetency and unfitness for the ballot.

The *News* believes that the record in Illinois is a final answer to those who oppose the suffrage amendment.

We believe, too, that the record in that state gives suffrage the greatest impetus it ever received.

But, as we said in the beginning, conclusions depend largely upon the politics of the observer.—*Buffalo Evening News*, 11, 9, 16.

* * *

THE WOMEN, GOD BLESS 'EM!

Now that the smoke of battle is clearing away and the God of Things as They Are is beginning to turn his illuminating lantern on the election returns the fact shines forth that the women's vote was possibly the biggest factor in the re-election of Wilson.

Women cast ballots in twelve states of the Union. Of these, only two—Illinois and Oregon—failed to give the President a majority. These states were nearly all normally Republican states. That they would switch was not even dreamed of by either Republicans or Democrats. In addition to the normal Republican strength there was the power—or possible power—of the Woman's party. This organization of women, formed for the single purpose of playing the part of a big stick in the political campaign, waved itself over the heads of the Democrats throughout all the suffrage states and said to the women voters: "Wilson is a stumbling block in the progress of women. He is not for a Federal amendment enfranchising woman. Hughes is. Vote for Hughes!"

But the women proved that when it is a choice between selfish advancement and patriotism, they are not to be delivered as a political unit. They voted for Wilson in spite of the tempting tid-bit held out by the Republican candidate, and thereby proved themselves worthy of the responsibility that their enfranchisement has placed upon them.

That it was the women's vote which largely turned the tide in the Western States is shown by the surprise at the outcome in the states themselves. Like the ugly duckling of the fairy story when she looked at herself in the stream of water and saw that she had been transformed into a snow-white swan, the

gods of the political machines of the Western States are still gazing at the returns from the ballot boxes and are murmuring, "Is this me or not me?"

It seems that the variableness attributed to the feminine person is not to be amputated from her ballot. When it comes to voting, she thinks independently; and the oft-repeated argument that a woman's vote will simply be a repetition of her husband's or her men folks' is shot into a thousand pieces. In spite of Republican promises and the harangues of the over-enthusiastic members of the Woman's party, the women of the West were true to their trust. They believed in Wilson, they wanted Wilson and they voted for Wilson.

God bless 'em!—*Baltimore Sun*, 11, 11, 16.

* * *

A WOMAN IN THE HOUSE

Whatever other tremendously important results may flow from the election of Tuesday, it can be writ down as certain that one character has been added to the list of Americans whose names will appear in the school histories of the future.

Miss Rankin not only is a Congressman—if a lady may be described as a Congressman—but she is one of very especial dignity; for she has been elected at large, and therefore is the representative of the whole State of Montana, rather than of a mere district. She has been elected to Congress on precisely the same basis that men are elected in other places, and on which, in the future, a good many other women will be sent to Congress: her brains, fitness, public services, and general right to recognition. *Washington (D. C.) Times*, 11, 9, 16.

* * *

Suggestions for Christmas Gifts

BILLFOLDS—Real leather and a convenient size, 25 cents each; $2.50 dozen.

CALENDAR (Perpetual)—Combination calendar and paper-weight with mirror back, 35 cents each; $3.50 dozen.

DIARY—A standard Diary with 8 pp. suffrage matter, 35 cents each; $3.50 dozen.

HAT PIN—Blue and rose gold "National Emblem" design, 35 cents each; $3.50 dozen.

POSTCARDS—(5 designs), 2 for 5 cents; 25 cents dozen; $1.00 per 100.

BOOKLETS—Brown booklet with special Xmas verse, 10 cents each; $1.00 dozen; $8.00 per 100.

NOVELTY CARD—"Land Sakes, it wouldn't seem like Christmas time, if I didn't wish you a Merry one," 10 cents each; $1.00 dozen; $8.00 per 100.

INCLOSURE CARDS—(Set of 6), 10 cents a set; $1.00 dozen sets.

RIBBON—10 yard bolt No. 1½, in repeat design "Votes for Women" and "Merry Christmas," 25 cents each; $2.75 dozen; $20.00 per 100.

STATIONERY—
Correspondence cards and paper, 30 cents each; $3.00 dozen.
Tinted paper bordered with yellow, 55 cents each; $5.50 dozen.
Correspondence cards (as above), 50 cents each; $5.00 dozen.

Add Postage to above.

NATIONAL WOMAN SUFFRAGE PUBLISHING CO., Inc.
171 Madison Ave., New York City

SUFFRAGE ADVANCES

While the importance of the women's vote in the presidential contest is open to debate, there is no doubt that the election marked a decided advance for the women's cause. For one thing, the contention that women would not avail themselves of the voting privilege, even though it were accorded them, appears not to have been well founded when 40 per cent. of the vote in a big state like Illinois is estimated to have been polled by women. Another interesting point is found in the statements that the women voters, though unused to the process, marked their ballots quickly, intelligently and with very few errors causing an invalidating of votes. It cannot be doubted that these developments will be of value to the women in promoting their campaign for suffrage in other states. It is true that in order to lend solid justification to their cause women's interest must be displayed, not in exceptional instances merely, but as a regular thing. But so far as it goes the recent election promises advantage to the suffragists.—*Springfield (Mass.) Union*, 11, 11, 16.

* * *

"BALLOTS FOR BOTH"

"Ballots for Both," a slogan submitted by Dr. Eleanor M. Hiestand-Moore of Philadelphia, has been awarded the $25.00 prize which the National American Woman Suffrage Association offered in its recent slogan contest. After an elaborate sifting process the contest jury selected the prize winner from the hundreds of entries as being the best expression of the suffrage demand that was submitted. The judges included Mr. Edgar Sisson of the *Cosmopolitan*, Mr. John O'Hara Cosgrave of the *New York World*, Mr. Frank Crowinshield of *Vanity Fair*, and Mr. Robert Davis of *Munsey's Magazine*.

Dr. Hiestand-Moore in a letter to Mrs. Ernest Thompson Seton, Chairman of the Slogan Contest, explained that she had come upon the phrase while canvassing in Philadelphia during the 1915 campaign. She was showing the suffrage map to an Italian laborer who had declared he was going to vote against the suffrage amendment.

"Women vote in all these states," she explained. "Why shouldn't the women of Pennsylvania vote?"

"Women in all thesa state vota and no men?" protested the Italian. "Lady, I can no believe."

Dr. Hiestand-Moore hastened to explain that the men voted too and that the suffragists did not by any means wish to take the vote away from men, but only to vote as well, whereupon the Italian bowed low and said: "You vota if you want, but Angelo, he vota too."

"Yes," Dr. Hiestand-Moore agreed, "Ballots for both, Angelo."

DATA DEPARTMENT.—MARY SUMNER BOYD.

GUARDIANSHIP LAWS IN PRACTICE.

Suffragists are often accused of making too great claims for the Equal Guardianship Laws of Equal Suffrage States and of pressing too hard clauses in the guardianship laws of certain male suffrage states which give the father the right to will or deed away his child over the head of the mother. On the latter point it is said that, though on the statute books of a few states, these clauses are not enforced nowadays; on the former, that a large number of the male suffrage states have as good provisions as the equal suffrage states.

To take this last point first; what are the facts?

Ten equal suffrage states have equal guardianship laws which give the mother equal rights with the father in respect to custody, control of education, religion, medical care, etc., of her children, equal rights to their earnings and an equal inheritance right in respect to them.* One, Illinois—a partial suffrage state in which women do not elect state legislators—restricts the mother's right in respect to earnings, to which the father has the first claim. Only the one equal suffrage state of Arizona is still in the black column with those states in which the father is sole guardian.

Twenty-one male suffrage states belong in this black column.† Of the others, the so-called "equal" guardianship male suffrage states, only five provide equality of the model type enjoyed by the ten equal suffrage states. These are:

Iowa,
Maine,
Minnesota,
New Hampshire and
Virginia.

In the following states equality is violated by the father's right to the children's earnings:

Connecticut,
Kentucky,
Missouri,
Nebraska and
Massachusetts.

Equality is almost obliterated in five other states where the father is, in varying degree in the different states, given rights to earnings, services, control of education, religion, medical care, superior inheritance rights and, in many other respects, a very decided preference over the mother. The states follow—it is hard to arrange them in order of demerit, as all are so bad—

Oklahoma,
New York,
Georgia,
Pennsylvania and
Alabama.

Thus, out of the 15 male suffrage states for which equal guardianship is claimed, only 5 come up to the standard, and over against these we can set ten out of twelve equal suffrage states with guardianship laws which are model in form.

The second point of common criticism is that the clause in the law of the three male guardianship states of Delaware, Florida and Tennessee, which gives the father power to will away his child is a dead letter on the statute books.

Maryland should probably be added to this group, but as there is a conflict of opinion and an apparent conflict in the laws of that state relating to guardianship we shall give it the benefit of the doubt. In other respects also this classification is made in a spirit, not of exaggeration but of moderation. In West Virginia the father can appoint a testamentary guardian of the child's property over the head of the mother, and in Alabama he can appoint a guardian of the child's person also after he is fourteen years old. But in the three which have been singled out for criticism, he has full and complete right to give away the child from its birth or before (en ventre sa mere). The mother's will in this matter is in these states, as the Florida law expresses it, "a nullity."

That these laws stand on the statute books in disparagement of the mother is sufficient criticism of the attitude of these male suffrage states toward women, even if the law were never applied. That a law which could never in decency be applied is left on the statute books would itself be a criticism.*

THREE INIQUITOUS GUARDIANSHIP LAWS

THE COMMON LAW PRINCIPLE:

"The legal power of a father, for a mother as such is entitled to no power, but only to reverence and respect; the power of a father, I say, over the persons of his children ceases at the age of twenty-one. . . . Yet, till that age arrives, this empire of the father continues even after his death, for he may by his will appoint a guardian for his children." (Even "en ventre sa mere.")—BLACKSTONE, Book 1, Sec. 453.

THE STATUTE LAW:

Delaware:

"A father may by deed or last will name a guardian for his child."—REV. CODE DEL., 1915, Ch. 118, Sub-div. 3916, Sec. 8.

Florida:

"Fathers may appoint guardians for their children during any part of infancy by deed in writing . . . . or by last will and testament. . . . A will by the mother of minor children undertaking to give the custody and care of such children to another is a nullity." 1914 CODE, Sec. 2603.

Tennessee:

"The father may by will or deed dispose of the custody of any legitimate child under the age of 21 and unmarried during the minority of such child. A mother has no power to appoint a testamentary guardian for her children."—CODE OF 1898, Sec. 4258.

But as long as a law stands it will sometimes be applied; a "dead letter on the statute books" can be galvanized to life by an unscrupulous or by an over-scrupulous lawyer.

Search for Delaware cases in proof of its actual occasional application was impossible, as the Delaware Digest and Reports were not accessible. In Tennessee it was decided that the mother has no power of appointing a testamentary

* Some guardianship laws are very simple in expression referring to custody merely and have to be supplemented by other statutes in order to make clear the full rights of parents over their children.

† These states are: Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Indiana, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Rhode Island South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, West Virginia, Wisconsin.

* For the cases cited below, thanks are due to Miss Mary O'Toole, of the District of Columbia bar.

guardian in 2 Tenn. Chy., 327; 9 Bax 436; 7 Heis, 466. From Florida comes the following case in recent years:

Hernandez v. Thomas, 50 Fla. Reps. 322 (1905). Wife obtained a divorce on ground of desertion, father did not contest suit and especially appeared to agree that the mother should be given the custody of the children. The mother died leaving a will appointing a guardian for the children; father contested and succeeded in obtaining the custody of the children, although it was shown by himself and others that he was financially and personally unable to care for them and had to place them in an institution.

The number of states where the father was irresponsible owner of his child to give or keep at his will was only a few years ago double what it is today; earlier still when there were more common law states, the number was larger still. In those days actual cases of its application were cited from Massachusetts (where it caused the Naramore murder) and New York, as far west as New Mexico. If the cases of recent years have been less easy to find and less flagrant seizures from the mother, it is because the shame of these old cases is too well known.

Not until 1913 did the Georgia father cease to have the right to do as he pleased with his child, and the mother no rights at all. Up to that very year no state gives more examples of the actual enforcement of this theoretical right of the father.

It was an instance of its enforcement which had much to do with changing the law.

A case coming before Judge Henry C. Hammond caused this fair-minded lawyer to write to his county delegation in the lower House putting it to them strongly that in this case he had taken children from their mother "because his hands had been absolutely tied by the peculiar moth-eaten Georgia law." This and agitation over the celebrated Tillman case finally changed the law.

Before this change, 33 Ga. St. Reps. 195, has been cited over and over as the law, and among other things it states that total divorce awarding custody of the child to the wife does not empower her to appoint a testamentary guardian if the father survive.

101 Ga. St. Reps. 124, holds that though the father fails to provide necessaries for his family during temporary separation, a contract of apprenticeship executed by the mother is void as to him.

The father's right to the custody of his child is also upheld in ex parte Davidge, 72 S. C. 16; ex parte Reynolds, 73 S. C. 296, and these decisions hold that the same principles apply to guardians under deed or will.

Ex parte Tillman, 84 S. C. 552, is the most notorious case in Georgia of a father attempting to deed away his two infant girls without the consent of the mother, Senator Tillman and his wife being the respondents to the petition for a writ of habeas corpus filed by the wife and mother. This case was decided in 1909, and the Code was later amended in accordance therewith. The mother had to show conclusively that she was a fit and proper person to have the care of the children as against the grandparents, who claimed under a written deed from their father, who was proved to be a person of intemperate habits. The courts held that the particular provision of the Code in question was a violation of the Constitutional rights of the mother and children as well as an infringement on the judicial branch of the government by the legislative.

The Tillman case was decided on broad-minded principles; on like principles, undoubtedly, many cases are decided in states with bad laws. Nevertheless the bad cases just cited still stand. Furthermore, few women have Mrs. Tillman's money or power to fight a case through to a finish. Most women do not fight the law at all; they have to accept it as it stands and give up their children without recourse to the courts. It is this large class of women who are the real sufferers under a bad law. This was well understood by the judge who did not make the case before him in the court the occasion for a decision contrary to the letter of the law, but instead, made it the occasion for having the law changed so that Georgia mothers would no longer have either passively to give up their children or carry their case to the courts.

* * *

INDIANA MEN BOOST SUFFRAGE

Indiana suffragists have not had too easy a path to travel in their efforts to spread the suffrage gospel over the Hoosier State, but the ground has now been broken thoroughly and suffrage is receiving a generous share of public approval. An evidence of this popularity of Votes for Women was shown in Peru, Indiana, on Election Day, when the men who came to the polls not only sought out the literature that the Woman's Franchise League was distributing, but also assisted in handing it out. "Help Us Change the Color of Indiana" was the title of the leaflet which showed the suffrage map, and if the issue had been voted on that day in Peru, it is certain Indiana would have become a white state in a very short time.

* * *

JUS SUFFRAGII

Organ of International Woman Suffrage Alliance (Carrie Chapman Catt, President). Are you eager to get a really masterly grip on the subject of Woman Suffrage? Do you wish to add to your power as a suffrage worker? If you do, read

JUS SUFFRAGII

regularly not intermittently. It gives you the "world view" on this world subject. It specializes on every important world event concerning women's work and political status.

MAIL THIS COUPON TO-DAY

Name.....

Address.....

JUS SUFFRAGII
New York Office
171 Madison Ave.

I enclose $1.00 for one year's subscription

Beginning Month of.....

FINANCE

Contributions received October 1st to 31st inclusive

ANNUAL PLEDGES

Mrs. S. E. Ostrander	$25 00
Wildwood, N. J., Equal Suffrage League	25 00
Amy Spingarn	100 00
Katherine Blake	25 00
Frances Baker	25 00
North Carolina Equal Suffrage Assn.	10 00
Martha Kimball	100 00
Mrs. Robert D. Evans	10,000 00
Mrs. Charles H. Bond	100 00
Virginia Wilhelm	5 00
Mrs. George Notman	200 00
Mrs. F. Louis Slade	250 00
Mrs. Augustus Peabody	200 00
Dr. Kate Baldwin	25 00
Equal Suffrage Party of Georgia	5 00
Mrs. Benjamin Pitman	200 00
Sara Wadsworth	50 00
Mrs. Edna S. Blair	16 00
Mrs. Henry W. Cannon	150 00
Ellen F. Adams	25 00
M. Eleanor Brackinridge	50 00
Mrs. Henry Patrick	25 00
	$11,611 00

GENERAL DONATIONS

Lucia McC. McBride	$25 00
Dr. William Allee	10 00
Mrs. William Allee	10 00
Mrs. Frank Bethell	20 00
Mrs. Robert S. Huse	15 00
Mrs. Louis Stevenson	$10 00
Natalie Holden Lovejoy	10 00
Mrs. M. Louise Ross	10 00
Mrs. Kate B. Lowry	12 50
Henrietta Scranton	1 00
Mrs. Effie Hoyt	5 00
Mrs. J. L. McCutcheon	10 00
Westport, Conn., Eq. Suf. League	50 00
Mrs. F. J. Tone	25 00
Mrs. H. A. Grant	100 00
	$313 50

CAMPAIGNS

Evanston, Ill., Pol. Eq. League	$71 00
Mary Lee	100 00
Nannie Lee	100 00
Teachers Section N. Y. State Woman Suffrage Party	100 00
College Eq. Suf. League, Cal.	100 00
Elizabeth A. Potter	10 00
Wisconsin W. S. Assn.	100 00
James L. Laidlaw	200 00
Nebraska W. S. Assn.	100 00
	$981 00

DUES

Kentucky Equal Rights Association	$150 00
Total	$13,055 50

NATIONAL AMERICAN WOMAN SUFFRAGE ASSOCIATION

171 Madison Avenue, New York.

Please find enclosed 25 cents in stamps to cover the cost of one year's subscription to the Headquarters News Letter, to be published once a month.

Name.....

Address.....

.....